

1-1-1980

Planners and Managers: separate parts in common cause

unknown

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_bonner



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

unknown, "Planners and Managers: separate parts in common cause" (1980). *Ernie Bonner Collection*. Paper 116.
http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_bonner/116

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ernie Bonner Collection by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

In summary, planners and managers perform separate functions in a partnership which is vital to local decision-makers in ~~their allocation of public funds~~ that common arena for planners and managers — the ~~budgeting~~ process of budgeting local public funds on behalf of city residents. The National Council of City Planning and Management Agencies is designed to ~~be the institutionalization of the~~ ^{and} respect the separate functions of planners and managers while holding pre-eminent their common cause and partnership.

assure the Mayor or City Council that public funds are available for the project, that those funds would be effectively utilized in such a project, and that the project is in the long-run best interests of ~~the city~~ city residents.

expenditures of the City. They are also ~~so~~ importantly interested in what the proposed public expenditure will accomplish. Planners are an important source of information for this latter concern. Not only would ~~they~~ ^{planners} ~~ask~~ question the leverage of the public funds — how much ~~would be~~ private ~~and~~ expenditure would be spurred by the ~~the~~ proposed public expenditure — but they would question the accomplishments of the joint public-private expenditure, as well as the possible deleterious affects of the ^(or project.) program.

And in making these determinations, planners ~~would~~ ~~make a set of assumptions, hypotheses, objectives, and purposes~~ ~~the~~ measure the proposal against a set of ~~po~~ objectives and policies they have derived as in the long-run best interests of the residents of the City.

~~In short, the managers can assure the Mayor or City Council that~~

In short, only a viable partnership of planners and

Local decision-makers are clearly interested in the use of public funds at their disposal. But rarely are ~~the~~ their intents so narrowly limited. Programs and development which, in their opinion, contribute to the city are their central concern — whether funded by public or private funds. Thus, they seek advice constantly from ~~the~~ ^(and ramifications) planners ~~and managers~~ about the merits of private development proposals and from managers about the effectiveness of public expenditures. ^{But} ~~the~~ planners and managers, with their separate vantage points, are vital partners in advice to local decision-makers in those programs where public funds are an incentive ^(or are complementary) to private expenditure of funds and the combination results in ^{net} demonstrable benefits to local residents.

In these many cases, managers are concerned with the level of public funds involved and the relationship between the expenditure proposed and all other possible

achieve some comprehensive change in their clients' environment. To achieve this goal it is obviously necessary to influence both public and private decisions and affect the allocation of both public and private resources in the direction of that desired change.

Managers have traditionally viewed their function as one designed to promote more effective use of public resources only. In achieving this goal it is not usually necessary to affect the use of private resources at all, nor is it necessary to affect the use of those public resources which are collected and expended by some public body other than the one in which they are employed.

Again, ~~a clear~~ no such definite limits nor independence can be assumed in practice. Yet, the distinction between ~~planners and managers~~ ^{the} objectives pursued by planners and managers is certainly clearer than the distinction in their function. A city planner, for example,

management — is more clearly maintained when approached from the vantage point of their respective objectives.

Planners have traditionally viewed their course as one designed to ~~advise~~ ~~both public and private~~ ~~defence~~

in the allocation of ~~but~~ resources. Managers limit their activity to that of ~~advice and~~ ~~advice~~ ^{the allocation of} about public resources only. ~~and not only those public resources which are under the control of the public body~~ Again, no such definite limits are assumed in practice, ~~but, the~~ redevelopment of ~~the public body~~ ~~at least in the central city is~~ ~~such a way as to accomplish certain fundamental~~ ~~community~~ ~~objectives~~ ~~but~~ but the concerns of planners are more comprehensive than the concerns of managers and this difference arises from a different set of objectives.

composition of the operating budget. Planners will advise decision-makers about the ~~expenditure of public~~

~~funds for capital improve~~ level and composition of the capital budget. (But the separation of the two ^{functions} ~~budgets~~ is rarely so clear because of the relationships between the two ~~budgets~~ ^{budgets}.

~~is clear~~ ^{in general} Some capital improvements increase operating costs, some reduce operating costs. Some program operations reduce the need for public capital investment, some increase the need for capital investment.

As a result, managers will often propose capital investments — particularly those ~~which~~ designed to reduce operating costs or increase services without cost — and planners will often propose changes in the operating budget. In this way, planners and managers are involved in the whole continuum from clearly operating to clearly capital expenditures though each has its traditional or ^{institutional} ~~task~~ role in one or the other.

The separation of the two functions — planning and

~~this common arena that they diverge somewhat in practice~~
~~and in this common arena that their important inter-~~
~~relationships ~~between them~~ must be considered.~~

~~Decisions about the expenditure of local funds are~~

~~Thus, both city planning and management are~~
~~ultimately concerned with~~

Thus, both city planning and management are ultimately concerned with local decisions as to the expenditure of public funds. This is their common arena, their crucial nexus. But within this common arena, they have separate responsibilities and, as a result, a necessary interrelationship.

~~Their separate responsibilities derive, in the main,~~
~~from different levels of objectives. Traditionally, city planners~~
~~have sought to achieve objectives~~

~~as an important example for purposes of exposition,~~
Consider, ~~for purposes of exposition,~~ the local government's annual budgeting process, as the common arena. Managers

not local citizens. Secord, their services are advisory,
not operational. ~~This distinguishes both planners and~~
~~managers from~~ This distinguishes the work of both planners
and managers from that of ~~operating~~ operating agency
directors and ~~personnel~~ personnel. ~~Through the hands of~~
~~operating agencies may~~ This does not mean that
planners & managers do not serve the needs of local
citizens, ~~only that their~~ for their advice to local
decision-makers (the immediate client) will often be on
behalf of local citizens. ~~It does not~~ Neither does
it mean that operating agency directors do not offer
advice, counsel & information to local decision-makers, only
that the ~~primary objective~~ immediate clients of the operating
agency are ~~the service needs~~ of local citizens, and the
primary objective is service to city residents.

Thus, both city planning and management
guiding the expenditure of public funds
are vitally concerned with overall city policy and it is ~~for~~

Planners and Managers — Separate Parts in Common Cause

Planning and management are nebulous terms, at best. This paper is not an attempt to define, in some metaphysical sense, what planning and management are. ~~but~~ It is an effort to describe what planners and managers do and how ~~far~~ ~~at their professional~~ the work of planners is related to that of managers.

As an introduction, it is ~~necessary~~ ^{important} to note that city planners and managers have ~~a~~ a fundamental common characteristic — both are responsible for advice, counsel and information to those empowered ~~and~~ to make decisions about the collection and expenditure of public funds. ~~In~~ In short, their clients are ~~local~~ local decision-makers, their ~~services~~ ~~are~~ services are advisory.

This ~~the~~ common and distinctive characteristic of ^{the work} of planners and managers ~~do~~ makes two points clear:

First, the ^{immediate} ~~recipients~~ clients of both are local ^{public} decision-makers.

2. client is decision-maker